

**UNCTAD Public Symposium 2010
10 - 11 May, 2010**

"Responding to Global Crises: New Development Paths"

Inputs received

Impact of the Global Economic Crises on Civil Society Organizations

Eva-Maria Hanfstaengl
Consultant
Financing for Development
Paul-List- Str. 17
04103 Leipzig
Germany
Tel: +49 341 215 8080
Email: hanfstaengl@gmx.net

Abstract

The food, environmental and economic crises have challenged civil society organizations (CSOs) and the communities they serve. A broad-based survey was undertaken in 2009, financially supported by the United Nations Secretariat, that measured the impact of the crises on the operating capacity of CSOs around the world and their expectations as they look ahead. This study examines the current situation of CSOs as indicated by responses from 640 civil society organizations worldwide. It also asks what strategies they are undertaking to cope with a drop in revenue and how they plan to strengthen social-service delivery capacities of CSOs during crisis periods.

Disclaimer:


The inputs are made available by the UNCTAD secretariat in the form and language in which they were received. The views reflected in the documents do not necessarily reflect the views of the United Nations or UNCTAD.



NGO Committee for
Social Development



Sisters of Charity Federation



Marianists International

UNCTAD's 2nd Public Symposium on Responding to Global Crises: New Development Paths International Policy Challenges for Sustainable Recovery

"Impact of the Global Economic Crises on Civil Society Organizations"

Executive Summary¹
of a study by Eva-Maria Hanfstaengl

New York, 15 February 2010

The food, environmental and economic crises have challenged civil society organizations (CSOs) and the communities they serve. A broad-based survey was undertaken in 2009, financially supported by the United Nations Secretariat, that measured the impact of the crises on the operating capacity of CSOs around the world and their expectations as they look ahead. This study examines the current situation of CSOs as indicated by responses from 640 civil society organizations worldwide. It also asks what strategies they are undertaking to cope with a drop in revenue and how they plan to strengthen social-service delivery capacities of CSOs during crisis periods.

¹ The full study is available at <http://ngosocdev.wordpress.com/2010/01/28/174/>, leave a comment at <http://ngosteering.wordpress.com/> or contact: hanfstaengl@gmx.net

A number of civil society organizations (CSOs) have reported substantial reductions in their funding in the wake of the global financial and economic crisis, and they are concerned that this threatens their ability to deliver the services and activities that are required. Seeking to understand better the global scope of this problem, the United Nations Secretariat initiated a study that was guided by a CSO Steering Committee, which included two members of the NGO Committee for Social Development (Marianists International and the Sisters of Charity Federation), as well as the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (FES) and the UN Non-Governmental Liaison Service. This briefing paper extracts from that study (for link see first page) to highlight limitations facing non-governmental organizations as providers of social services and the essential role of state institutions.

Efforts to disseminate the survey around the world resulted in a wide *regional coverage* of CSO experiences and views: Of the 640 CSOs that responded to the survey, 33% were from Africa, 23% were from Asia, including China, 16% were from Western Europe, 13% from the US and Canada, 9% Latin America, 3% Eastern Europe, 2% Japan, Australia, New Zealand, and 1% from Ukraine.

As might be expected, there has been a variety of experiences in resource flows to CSOs, with many seeing increases although even more CSOs suffered declines. Whereas 378 responses still indicated an increase from 2008 onwards, a bigger number of 582 responses saw a decrease in the different categories of funding: 147 responses saw a decline in direct personal contributions, 104 CSOs experienced reductions by private foundations, 95 by international institutions, 87 by governments and 71 by corporations.

Regional differences in the impact of the global crises on CSOs

Regions saw different changes in overall funds flowing into CSOs during the crisis period. CSOs that have a more diversified structure of funding, as in the United States, Canada and Western Europe, are better able to withstand the negative consequences of the financial crisis on their supporters. CSOs that rely relatively heavily on corporate giving and private foundations have been most challenged to maintain their services, as many of these donors have been directly affected by the financial crisis. Particularly negative results have been noted for CSOs in Sub-Saharan Africa.

In **Sub-Saharan Africa** a significant majority of CSOs participating in the survey reported budgets cuts in 2008 and 2009. Most CSOs reported a drop in receipts from the private sources of funds, including from private foundations and corporations. The same can be observed for grants from international institutions and governments. Big reductions are coming from corporate donors.

The hope for increases of funding, as expressed by several CSOs in Africa, will probably not materialize. The World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF) forecast that, despite all poverty reduction efforts, 353 million Sub-Saharan Africans will still be extremely poor in 2015.² The need for substantially more social spending in the region, including by CSOs, is clear.

CSOs in **Asia** show a slightly different structure of revenues. They are less dependent on international institutions, instead getting support mainly from individual donations and private foundations. Had Asia's earlier economic growth rates continued, the number of people living in extreme poverty in 2009 would have been about 82 million fewer than it is, according to the UN Secretariat.³ This may be set against the total number of extremely poor people in the region, which the World Bank and IMF estimate at 734 million in 2009. This number of people in extreme poverty is about 11% higher than it might have been without the crises. In this regard, the conjunctural impact on poverty seems to have been greater thus far in Asia than Africa. The overall poverty rate in Asia, however, has fallen to about 21% of the population, as economic growth has been consistently strong in China, India and a number of other countries in the region. Indeed, the World Bank and IMF forecast the number of extremely poor people will fall to 520 million by 2015. This more dynamic economic situation seems to be reflected in the budgets that CSOs from the region participating in the survey reported in 2008 and 2009. While many CSOs reported a decline in budgets, as elsewhere, the majority still managed to increase their spending and thus their activities in both years.

² World Bank and IMF, *Global Monitoring Report, 2009*, table 1.6.

³ Unless otherwise indicated, this and subsequent estimates for 2009 and forecasts for 2010 are drawn from United Nations, *World Economic Situation and Prospects*, 2010.

The poverty impact of the current crisis in **Latin America and the Caribbean** seems to have been closer to the Asian than African experience. Responding CSOs from Latin America and the Caribbean rely mostly on individual donors, international institutions and governments. The number of people in extreme poverty could have been 4 million less than it was (40.3 million), implying 10% more extremely poor people than might otherwise have been expected in 2009.⁴ But only 7% of the population in this region falls into the category of extreme poverty. While it is unacceptable that 33 million people in the region are forecast to be extremely poor in 2015, the World Bank and IMF expect that the region as a whole will achieve the MDG goal of halving poverty. This notwithstanding, it appears that the majority of the responding CSOs in the region were hampered from playing as strong a role in social support as they might have, as their budgets suffered decreases since 2008.

CSOs from **developed countries**, Western European countries and from the US and Canada are also less dependent on international institutions and show quite a diversified structure of revenue, receiving funds mainly from personal contributions, governments and private foundations.

In *Europe*, only CSOs in a few smaller countries have so far experienced a reduction in contributions due to the economic crises. In general, it appears that Western European CSOs have relatively less volatile funding than their Sub-Saharan counterparts, which might reflect generally larger and longer established organizations and funding relations in Europe. Some CSOs also serve as a channel for disbursement of official development assistance (ODA). Most donor governments in the EU remain committed so far to achieving the UN target of spending 0.7 per cent of gross national income (GNI) as ODA by 2015, with many adopting intermediate targets also as ratios to GNI. However, there is a danger that if economic recession in 2010 causes a fall in GNI, aid budgets could also be reduced, maintaining the ODA/GNI ratio. Such an approach would be especially disruptive to aid-receiving countries – not to mention CSOs – that count on significant ODA support for their programmes. Many CSOs in the EU therefore fear reductions in the upcoming 1 to 2 years.

CSOs in *Australia and New Zealand* seem only slightly negatively effected so far. Also, most responding CSOs in the *US and Canada* did not yet see an overall negative impact of the crisis on their budgets. However, a significant portion of the disbursements of US CSOs are supported by foundations. While flows in the short-term are often parts of programs agreed in earlier years, many foundations have been hit hard by the financial crisis. As long as these foundations do not make major changes in the allocations to different categories of grantees, these negative trends could have a direct impact on the recipient CSOs in 2010 and 2011. US government funding increased in 2008 and increased slightly in 2009. CSOs that receive US government funding were therefore in a less dire situation. Some US CSOs even reported a doubling of funds due to rising support from the US government. Nevertheless, some of them warned that it is too early to say if this tendency will endure. “At the end of the day governments will have to balance their books, so it is too early to tell.” Also, with high unemployment rates, individuals' disposable income is less likely to come to charities and non-profit organizations.

Revenue decline confronts an increased demand for services

The data confirm that 2008 and 2009 marked a special challenge for CSOs worldwide. Most of the responding CSOs reported budget decreases in those years that were threatening to compromise their ability to deliver services and activities. Civil society organizations around the world that participated in this study reported that most government proposals to deal with the global crisis did not sufficiently address their social consequences, such as rising inequalities, increased food insecurity and volatile energy and commodity prices. The CSOs themselves are faced with the challenge of stepping into this gap, as the revenue decline comes at the same time as demand for services is increasing, requiring more, not less, funding. CSOs report that the amount and scope of requests for support by the constituencies and partners of civil society organizations is growing. More than half of the responding CSOs reported that demand for services has already risen substantially. One major purpose of this survey was to find out if the scope of requests by the constituencies and partners of civil society organizations changed due to the global crises.

⁴ Estimates in this paragraph also draw on references above.

This hypothesis is largely confirmed by the results of the survey: CSOs project for the next two years further increases in requests, as well as for support to provide basic social services.

In sum, most development CSOs have had to cope with a financial strain and reacted with a series of strategies. To stretch resources, 80% of the organizations have developed better collaborative networks with other CSOs, especially those locally based. 78% started additional fundraising campaigns, exploring the remaining or new opportunities in their countries or within their constituencies. As a result, competition between NGOs for funding is rising. CSOs extended their use of Internet tools. Some CSOs report cutbacks in their administration cost, staff and aid programmes. Most of them intensified their advocacy work to “reform the system of sporadic aid.”

Recommendations

CSOs participating in the survey endorsed a number of proposals for reform at national and international level that would boost development and poverty eradication efforts. A high percentage, about 80% of the 397 CSOs who responded to these questions, thinks that a high priority should be given to introducing more efficient measures to fight corruption, reduce opportunities for tax evasion and recover illicit financial flows. To mobilize the required financial resources for social safety nets in developing countries, CSOs see the need for more progressive and redistributive national tax systems, utilizing a broad and equitable tax base, and targeting those most able to pay. They think that earnings from capital transactions and resource extraction should be taxed more heavily than earnings from labour.

Direct government income support is needed to help reduce poverty. Again, 80% of the responding CSOs strongly favoured the introduction of basic income grants for the poorest and most vulnerable at national level that would provide a minimum income for each citizen that allows him or her to participate in society at least at a minimum level. The money of people not in need or not in poverty would be recovered through adjustments in the tax system. Other valuable proposals supported by CSOs are the establishment of a global pension fund and the ILO’s Decent Work Agenda⁵ and Global Jobs Pact, which is aimed at generating jobs and providing protection to working people and their families.⁶

The global crises threaten to reverse critical gains made towards reducing poverty and hunger and achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Lower income countries need additional financial assistance to protect essential social expenditures and prevent further erosion of progress made in reducing poverty. CSOs thus called on donor governments to **increase official development assistance (ODA)**. 74% of the responses see it as the highest priority that donor governments meet and increase their existing official development aid commitments. Also, almost three quarters of the responses strongly recommend that more development aid be channelled through CSOs on the ground, in particular in countries in which CSOs have faced public corruption and policy indifference.

As the financing gap is large, especially when consideration is given to the additional funding that is urgently required for meeting the adaptation and mitigation challenges of climate change. As a result, the discussion and exploration of new and innovative financing mechanisms is gaining momentum, as was reflected in the answers to the questionnaire and the majority (55%) of the responding CSOs think that donor governments should therefore step up their official development assistance and develop additional and innovative sources of financing, such as the air ticket levy, transfers to developing countries for carbon credits or imposing a financial transaction tax to finance global public goods.

A “UN Charter for a sustainable and socially oriented market economy”

Leaders at the Group of 20 (G20) Summit in London in 2009 had recommended developing a charter on sustainable economic activity. The elements of such a charter are not clearly defined yet and remain under discussion within the G20 and plan to table a proposal end of 2010. In any case, the crises demonstrate the urgent need for the establishment of such an overall normative framework of global governance, which

⁵ www.ilo.org/global/About_the_ILO/Mainpillars/WhatisDecentWork/lang--en/index.htm

⁶ ILO June 2009: www.ilo.org/global/What_we_do/Officialmeetings/ilc/ILCSessions/98thSession/texts/lang--en/docName--WCMS_115076/index.htm

could establish principles for the world economy and for mechanisms of international cooperation in response to shared economic vulnerabilities. It is no surprise therefore, that almost three quarters of the CSOs (73%) see an urgent need for the establishment of such an overall normative framework of global governance, however within the UN. They pointed out the need to bring into financial, trade and development discussions the central social commitments and human rights obligations that could otherwise be lost.

The need for automatic counter-crisis support

The current situation demonstrates that the ability of CSOs to mobilize private resources weakens during a crisis just when the need for their services rises. Individual donors around the world have been less able than before to step up their assistance. Similarly, private foundations faced reduced capacity to deliver funds as their own assets declined substantially in value. The food and environmental crises as well as the 2008-2009 financial crisis have shown clearly that in this increasingly interdependent and globalizing world, difficult situations can happen in the different regions of the world at more or less the same time. In order to avoid unbearable social cost and increasing poverty, there is a need for “counter-cyclical” action. The central conclusion of the study summarized here has been that civil society organizations cannot do it by themselves with their usual sources of private and personal funding. Therefore, governments and international institutions need to step in with additional financial support for the social activities of CSOs during global crises. The question arises whether there is a way to institutionalize automatic or semi-automatic financial support to fund necessary social programmes of CSOs during global crises.

The ILO initiated a “*Global Jobs Pact*” and the Chief Executives Board of the UN System proposed the establishment of a “*Social Protection Floor*”. Such a protection floor, in a system-wide approach, could protect affected people during crises and thereafter. It would assure physical and financial access to essential public services, such as water, sanitation, health and education. It would also provide a set of essential social transfers to the poor and vulnerable to provide a minimum income and secure access to essential social services. While it is encouraging that this and other approaches are under international discussion, there is no answer yet to the question of how to assure immediate and sufficient financial support during crisis periods for affected civil society organizations and the people they serve at the grass-roots level. The most promising option discussed at this moment and favoured by responding CSOs for such additional funds is the **Financial Transaction Tax (FTT)** which would be established by national governments to tax transactions within their jurisdictions in all kinds of financial assets: shares, bonds, securities and derivatives. It is expected that a tax rate of just 0.1% would yield globally 734.8 billion USD. For Europe the figure would be 321.3 billion USD.⁷

Given the high degree of global economic and financial integration, global crises may occur with increasing frequency. It must therefore be a high priority on the political agenda to take all necessary steps to slow and adapt to climate change, avoid another food crisis and prevent new financial crises. Should those crises happen again or the current ones continue, the world community should be better prepared, and – as an immediate short-term measure – at least provide the financial means, including supporting CSOs that can help address the harm that threatens society’s poorest and most vulnerable members. **Mobilizing stable and predictable** funds for achieving the Millennium Development Goals and other social development goals requires a sense of political urgency. The huge resources quickly mobilized for the financial rescues in the major developed economies show what is possible. It remains to treat social development challenges in the same way.

⁷ Stephan Schulmeister, Margit Schratzenstaller, Oliver Picek (2008): A General Financial Transaction Tax. Motives, Revenues, Feasibility and Effects. Vienna